

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed March 16, 2004. Claims 50, 51, 58 and 59 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 48, 49, 52-55, 57, 60, and 63-65 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 48, 49, 52-57, and 60-67 are now pending in this case.

Claims 48-52 and 54-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,343,524 to Mu et al. ("Mu") in view of U.S. Patent No. Re. 35,839 to Asai et al. ("Asai"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Amended claim 48 recites a manipulation apparatus for use with an information processing apparatus, where the manipulation apparatus is detachably connectable to a "first interface means" of the information processing apparatus and where a recording medium is detachably mountable to "a second interface means" of the information processing apparatus. Claim 48 also recites that the manipulation apparatus comprises "read-only memory means inerasably stored with a first security code," and "comparison means which compares the first security code with a second security code . . . being read from [a] recording medium into said information processing apparatus." Claim 48 further recites "operation control means which transmits confirmation data to the information processing apparatus when the codes coincide with each other . . . whereby a judgment is made as to whether said recording medium is authentic with respect to the manipulation apparatus." [Emphasis added.]

Mu, to the contrary, discloses that the ISD is connected between a PC and a peripheral device, such as a manipulation apparatus, and cuts off the communication between the PC and the peripheral device during a verification procedure for the ID and password. Therefore, the ISD is connected to the PC, however, the peripheral device is not. Mu also teaches that a security code is programmable (i.e., erasably stored) in a

programmable CPU assembled in an intelligent security device (ISD) (col. 9, lines 50-68) and, further, that the ID and password are installed by programming the CPU in the ISD by a programmer who wants to distribute an application program. Thus, the ISD of Mu is customized to the application distributed with the programmed ISD. Further, Mu does not teach or suggest a device that “transmits confirmation data to the information processing apparatus when the codes coincide with each other,” as recited by claim 48. Mu teaches instead that once a match of pass codes is confirmed at the ISD, the “process proceeds,” without data being transmitted from the ISD to the host computer. (Col. 10, lines 33-39).

In addition to the above, the Office Action acknowledges that Mu does not teach or suggest an information processing apparatus reading a security code which is stored in a recording medium and transmitting the code to a peripheral apparatus. (Office Action, at 2-3). The Office Action relies on Asai as teaching “a CD-ROM disk with the security code recorded in it.” (Office Action, at 3). Asai, however, discloses only comparing a security code stored in a CD-ROM with a stored security code. Asai does not teach or suggest a manipulation apparatus having comparison means for comparing a first security code inerasably stored in the manipulation apparatus with a second security code read from the CD-ROM into the information processing apparatus and sent to the manipulated apparatus, as defined by claim 48. Therefore, Asai does not cure the deficiencies of Mu.

Thus, even if there were motivation to combine these two references, which there is none, the combination still does not teach or suggest every limitation recited by claim 48. For at least these reasons, claim 48 is allowable over Mu and Asai and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 49 recites a manipulation apparatus comprising “read-only memory means inerasably stored with a first security code.” Claim 49 also recites an information processing apparatus having a first interface means to which the manipulation apparatus is

detachably connectable and a second interface means from which an application program is read into the information processing apparatus. Claim 49 further recites “operation control means which transmits confirmation data to the information processing apparatus when the first and second codes coincide.” Claim 49 is allowable for at least those reasons given above in connection with claim 48, and also because none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the inventive combination defined by claim 49.

Claim 54 recites an information processing system comprising an information processing apparatus having first and second interface means to which a manipulation apparatus and a storage medium are respectively connectable. Claim 54 also recites that the manipulation apparatus has “a read-only memory means inerasably stored with a second security code.” At least for those reasons, as well as those reasons mentioned above, claim 54 is allowable over Mu and Asai. In addition claim 54 is allowable because none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the inventive combination defined by claim 54.

Claim 57 recites an information processing method comprising, “reading an application program and a first security code stored in a recording medium into [an] information process apparatus.” Claim 57 also recites “supplying the first security code . . . to [a] manipulation apparatus and comparing a second security code, which is inerasably stored in . . . said manipulation apparatus.” Claim 57 further recites “transmitting confirmation data from the manipulation apparatus to the information processing apparatus when the first security code coincides with the second security code.” Claim 57 is allowable for at least those reasons given above in connection with claim 48 and also because none of the cited references teach or suggest the inventive combination defined by claim 57.

Claims 52, 55, 56 and 60-67 depend from claims 48, 54, and 57, and are allowable for at least the reasons mentioned above in connection with claims 48, 54 and 57

and also because none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the respective inventive combinations defined by claims 52, 55, 56 and 60-67.

Claim 53 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mu in view of Asai and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,544,083 to Iizuka et al. (“Iizuka”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Claim 53 which depends from claim 48, further recites a peripheral apparatus comprising: “a tablet having X and Y matrix electrodes for emitting radio waves; a pen type object having an antenna for receiving the radio waves emitted from said matrix electrodes and a switch; and a page sensor for detecting a page of a picture book placed on said tablet, wherein an instruction in response to which said program is executed on the information processing apparatus is defined by positioning said pen type object at a predetermined location in said picture book placed on said tablet.” [Emphasis added].

Claim 53 is allowable over Mu and Asai at least for the reasons mentioned above. The Office Action relies on Iizuka for its teaching of “a pen type object.” (Office Action, at 7.) Iizuka does not cure the deficiencies of Mu and Asai, as mentioned above, and therefore, at least for these reasons, claim 53 is allowable.

Further, none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the inventive combination defined by claim 53. For example, Iizuka does not teach or even suggest a “pen type object having an antenna for receiving the radio waves.” [Emphasis Added]. In fact, Iizuka does not even mention radio waves. Thus, even if there was motivation to combine the three references, which there is none, they still do not teach or suggest every limitation of claim 53, as required under M.P.E.P. § 2143 in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: June 16, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No. 28,371

Salvatore P. Tamburo

Registration No. 45,153

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &

OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicants